

Validation of the Wind Erosion Equation (WEQ) for discrete periods[☆]

R.S. Van Pelt^{a,*}, Ted M. Zobeck^b

^a USDA-ARS Wind Erosion and Water Conservation Research Unit, 302 W. I-20, Big Spring, TX 79720, USA

^b USDA-ARS Wind Erosion and Water Conservation Research Unit, 3810 4th Street, Lubbock, TX 79415, USA

Received 27 September 2002; received in revised form 21 December 2002; accepted 18 February 2003

Abstract

The Wind Erosion Equation (WEQ) is currently used by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to ensure compliance with government guidelines for soil loss from agricultural land. The model uses inputs of soil texture, annual mean climate data, statistically derived wind energy apportionment tables, and field management options to predict soil loss on a management period and annual basis. In this study, we compared estimates of wind erosion derived from the sums of field measurements at seven locations, two of which had multiple years of observations (a total of 14 periods of comparison), with the predictions of WEQ. WEQ under-predicted the observed estimates of 11 of the 14 periods by as much as a factor of nine. For the three periods that WEQ over-predicted observed erosion estimates, the factor was less than 1.5. Across all sites and periods considered in this investigation, WEQ only predicted about 53% of the observed estimated erosion. Analysis of two average years at Big Spring, TX, indicated that WEQ could be locally calibrated by use of increased climatic (C') and soil erodibility (I) values as well as combinations of the two.

© 2003 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Wind erosion; Soil loss; Predictive models

Software availability

Name of software Wind Erosion Equation Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet

Developer Mike Sporic and Leigh Nelson, USDA-NRCS, 2145 Basin St., SW, Ephrata, Washington 98823-9451, USA. Tel.: +1-509-754-2463; fax: +1-509-754-4705. E-mail: leigh—nelson@waephata.fsc.usda.gov

Year first available 1999

Hardware required IBM Compatible PC with 486/33 processor or better and 16 MB RAM

Software required MS Windows 3.1 or later, MS Excel
Program language this program is an MS Excel linked spreadsheet with multiple pages

Program size 1.11 MB

Availability and cost available free from leigh—nelson@waephata.fsc.usda.gov

1. Introduction

In the United States, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is the primary agency charged with the task of reducing wind erosion associated with production agriculture. The NRCS has used the Wind Erosion Equation (WEQ) (Woodruff and Siddoway, 1965) to assess the effects of field management on the potential for wind erosion for the last two decades. By using this model, the NRCS is able to direct producers toward crop management systems that effectively reduce erosion.

The WEQ uses inputs of soil erodibility (I'), soil surface ridge and soil aggregate roughness (K'), a locally calibrated climatic factor that is a function of predicted soil moisture and wind speed (C'), field length adjusted for any upwind protection (L'), and equivalent vegetat-

* Corresponding author. Tel./fax: +1-432-263-3154.

E-mail address: svanpelt@lbr.ars.usda.gov (R.S. Van Pelt).

[☆] The mention of trade or manufacturer names is for information only and does not imply an endorsement, recommendation, or exclusion by USDA-ARS.

ive or crop residue cover (V) to predict the potential annual wind erosion for a given field and set of management variables. According to Woodruff and Siddoway (1965), the annual amount of soil eroded from a given field is a function of the factors listed above. While the factors are regarded as multiplicative, most of the actual input values are derived from maps (C'), tables (I'), or complex graphs (K' , L' , and V) and the estimation of erosion in the original publication was made with a graphical solution. The advent of computers has greatly simplified the usage of the WEQ for field personnel and several computer program versions have been written and disseminated but, to date, there have been no reliable field data with which to validate the model.

Wind erosion modeling efforts by the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) over the last decade have necessitated the collection of several large bodies of wind erosion and weather data from many diverse locations in the United States. This effort has been facilitated by the development of technology and equipment that have enabled the measurement of wind erosion losses on storm event basis (Fryrear, 1986; Stout and Zobeck, 1996). The availability of field measurements has improved the description of erosion losses across a field (Stout, 1990) and also permits the validation of wind erosion models. We tested WEQ against much of the aforementioned body of data in order to determine the accuracy of its predictions.

The Global Change and Terrestrial Ecosystems Soil Erosion Network (GCTE-SEN) has recently conducted a model validation exercise for water erosion models (see Ingram et al., 1996). Several models are also available to estimate wind erosion losses, but few studies have compared the output from these models with field-measured data. In this study, as part of a GCTE-SEN project, we evaluate how well the predictions of erosion made with the WEQ compare with data collected from eroding fields. We also investigate the appropriate factors that may be changed to calibrate WEQ for local climate and soil conditions.

2. Methods

Seven sites from six states across the United States were chosen to validate WEQ. The site locations, years of comparisons, soil classification, soil erodibility index (I'), and climate factor (C') are presented in Table 1. The sites were described, instrumented, and the erosion data were collected by USDA-ARS and USDA-NRCS personnel. All the sites were a 100 m radius circular field (~2.5 ha) (Fig. 1) outfitted with a weather station using a Campbell Scientific 21X datalogger and instrumentation and 13 erosion sampling stations consisting of Big Spring Number Eight (BSNE) (Fryrear, 1986) saltation samplers set at 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1 m, and, in some

cases, 2 m above the surface (Fig. 2). Weather data collected included instantaneous rainfall, air temperature, solar radiation and 0.1 m depth soil moisture at 10-min intervals and wind speed and direction at 1-min intervals. Soil surface condition data, including soil surface ridge height, random roughness from soil aggregates, crusting, percent erodible fraction in the absence of crusting, and standing and flat plant residues were collected several times a season.

Soil saltation and suspension loads at each of the 13 field locations were estimated by integrating the weight of sediment collected in the BSNE samplers at each location and calculating the transport load at that location. Creep load was estimated for each of the 13 locations in a similar manner based upon transported soil weights collected in creep samplers at four locations in the field. Field soil loss for each event was calculated using soil transport estimates from selected locations across the field. Details of erosion estimation based upon transport estimates are presented in Fryrear et al. (1998). Since all these field erosion observations are calculated estimates based upon actual measured observations, we will refer to the erosion data as observed estimates.

A spreadsheet version of WEQ developed by Mike Sporcic and Leigh Nelson of the USDA-NRCS in Spokane WA was used to evaluate the accuracy of WEQ. This spreadsheet version requires user input of field identification and width, tillage direction, field orientation, and field length (L') to calculate L' . Input values for the climatic factor (C'), soil erodibility (I'), and soil wind erodibility group were taken from menus that summarize the appropriate sections of Part 502 National Agronomy Handbook (USDA-SCS, 1978). Internal menus allow selection of local average wind direction and percent erosive velocity data tables for specified locations, crop and crop productivity for determination of equivalent vegetative cover and crop residue (V), and field management for determination of soil surface roughness (K'). The crop and field management is entered by user specified date, allowing one to calculate from the spreadsheet ridge height and spacing, standing biomass, standing and flat residue, and random roughness for the period extending from that entry to the next. The model predicts the potential erosion for each of these management periods and sums them to obtain average annual wind erosion.

We entered previous crop and tillage management information as was presented in the field notes and records. In order to obtain a better fit of the menu choices and internal calculations with field observations, we occasionally adjusted tillage operations by adding new tillage implements to the menu to create residue and roughness effects similar to those observed and sparsely planted crops during periods where photographs indicated that weeds were developing in the fields. Management dates were chosen to coincide with the dates of

Table 1

Test site locations, soils and climate factors

Location	Years of comparison	Soil classification	I'	C'
Big Spring, TX	1989, 1990, 1993–97	Amarillo fine sandy loam	86	60
Kennett, MO	1993, 1994	Farrenburg fine sandy loam	86	10
		Malden loamy fine sand	134	
Eads, CO	1991	Wiley silt loam	56	90
Elkhart, KS	1992	Dalhart fine sandy loam	86	70
Sidney, NE	1990	Alliance silt loam	56	50
Prosser, WA	1992	Shano silt loam	56	55
Mabton, WA	1991	Quincy loamy fine sand	134	50




Fig. 1. Diagram of typical Wind Erosion Modeling (WERM) field from which wind erosion observed estimates were made.



Fig. 2. Typical erosion sampling station cluster of Big Spring Number Eight (BSNE) saltation samplers.

field sampler installation and removal so that the WEQ predictions of erosion could be summed to coincide with the period of actual field data collection.

3. Results and discussion

A summary of WEQ simulation results and comparisons with observed estimates is presented in Table 2. Averaged across all sites and years of comparison, WEQ predicted only 53.3% of the observed estimated erosion. WEQ only predicted 37.5 % of the observed estimated erosion at Big Spring for all 7 years of comparisons. If we remove the comparisons for 1996, a year having much lower than normal average winds, WEQ only predicted 22.6% of the observed estimated erosion. Similar results were noted for most of the other sites with the exception of relatively good agreement between WEQ predictions and observed estimated erosion for Eads, CO, and Elkhart, KS, both of which are located near the area where WEQ was developed. Highly variable results were noted between the two years of comparison at Kennett, MO. Dissimilar surface conditions between the two years of comparison are reflected in the differences in WEQ predicted erosion, but the differences in observed estimated erosion between the two years was much greater than in the predicted erosion. On-site wind data indicated that 1993 was much windier than 1994 resulting in observed estimated erosion in 1993 of more than 20 times that noted in 1994.

WEQ uses statistical wind distribution data for input wind parameters and therefore should not be expected to match each year's observed estimated erosion since the magnitude, duration, and direction of erosive winds vary from year to year. Woodruff and Siddoway (1965) state that wind speeds are normally distributed. Analysis of 5-min average and daily average wind speed for Big Spring, TX, indicates that this is not the case. Winds of erosive velocity typically occur only a few hours out of the day and a few days per month. Long periods of sub erosive velocity winds separate the extreme events. Additionally, saltation particle impact data (Sensit Erosion Monitor, Sensit Corporation, Portland, ND, USA) for Big Spring, TX, would indicate that daily average wind speed is a very poor predictor of wind erosion activity. It was not uncommon to note three orders of magnitude higher saltation activity on a day with a lower

Table 2

Summary of WEQ predicted erosion, observed estimated erosion, and comparison

Location	Year	Comparison period ^a	WEQ predicted (kg m ⁻²)	Observed estimates (kg m ⁻²)	WEQ/observed (%)
Big Spring, TX	1989	01/12/89–05/03/89	4.49	21.54	20.8
Big Spring, TX	1990	01/05/90–05/04/90	4.66	20.96	22.2
Big Spring, TX	1993	03/16/93–06/01/93	3.17	28.78	11.0
Big Spring, TX	1994	01/06/94–05/18/94	4.67	17.16	27.2
Big Spring, TX	1995	01/11/95–05/15/95	4.88	26.29	18.5
Big Spring, TX	1996	01/12/96–05/16/96	5.07	3.99	127.1
Big Spring, TX	1997	01/23/97–05/23/97	4.86	13.63	35.6
Eads, CO	1991	10/30/90–05/07/91	2.36	2.43	97.2
Elkhart, KS	1992	01/01/92–10/15/92	19.72	15.50	127.2
Kennett, MO	1993	12/02/92–06/17/93	1.53	13.73	11.1
Kennett, MO	1994	11/18/93–05/05/94	0.89	0.64	139.4
Mabton, WA	1991	12/13/90–04/28/91	0.60	3.68	16.3
Prosser, WA	1992	06/10/92–06/15/93	0.17	0.32	51.8
Sidney, NE	1990	10/24/89–04/24/90	0.18	0.44	40.7

^a Date format: mm/dd/yy.

daily average wind speed than another day within the same week.

Attempts to create simulation conditions that would allow WEQ to more closely predict the erosion for 1989 and 1990 at Big Spring, TX, two average years, yielded interesting results. We at first assumed that the wind velocity parameter in the C' factor was perhaps underestimated for this location. C' values were varied from 60 to 150, 2.5 times the given value for the location and the maximum value indicated for any location, and yet WEQ only predicted 57.3% and 60.2% of the observed estimated erosion for 1989 and 1990, respectively. The C' factor had to be increased to 222, a value nearly four times that published for the site, in order for the predicted erosion to be 95.6% and 104.4% of the observed estimated erosion for 1989 and 1990, respectively. Woodruff and Armbrust (1968) recommend the use of a monthly C' that improves the accuracy of WEQ simulations. While monthly values for the erosive season at Big Spring are larger than the annual value, they are still too low to allow good agreement between WEQ predictions and observed estimates in the two years investigated. Further, there is no provision for varying the C' value within years of simulation in this version of WEQ; so management periods would have to be separated by months, individual annual simulations run with C' values for each month, and the appropriate soil loss figures would have to be summed across 12 simulations for a single year's prediction. This problem could, however be solved by the modification of the spreadsheet and a table of monthly C' values by location.

While holding the value for C' at 150, the soil erodibility index, I' , was increased to 134 to provide a prediction of 98.4% and 105% of the observed estimate for 1989 and 1990, respectively. If we returned the C' value to 60 and increased the soil erodibility index, I' , to the

maximum value of 310, WEQ predicted 101.4% and 108.1% of the observed estimates for the respective years. Although reasonably good fits can be obtained by varying the I' value alone, it would be difficult to predict erosion for a soil more erodible than a fine sandy loam and many agricultural soils in this area are loamy fine sands and fine sands. It should be pointed out, however that the soil erodibility index, I' , values for WEQ are based upon the percentage of soil aggregates in the upper inch of soil larger than 0.84 mm. While this value may be appropriate for freshly tilled soils, rainfall often results in the disintegration of aggregates, crusting of the soil, and creation of a surface mantle of sandy abraded material. This sandy abraded material is usually the first material to move during a wind event and thus the apparent texture of the surface soil would approximate the soil for which a soil erodibility index, I' , of 310 would be appropriate.

4. Conclusion

Increasing the annual input value of C' to nearly four times the published value did allow close agreement between predicted and observed erosion as did increasing the value of I' to the upper limit and combinations of increased C' and I' input values. The use of increased values of I' could be explained by the texture of the surface mantle of fine sand resulting from the rain induced disintegration of soil aggregates and points to the importance of soil surface conditions in controlling wind erosion and the necessity of careful characterization of these soil surface conditions when running predictive wind erosion models.

Even though we were successful in finding ways of calibrating WEQ to match average wind erosion for a

location, it should be emphasized that only one of the seven locations provided sufficient data to attempt such a calibration. Attempts to calibrate WEQ with less than several years' data could result in even greater inaccuracy than with running WEQ with the published input values for C' and I' values. While WEQ was a good empirical model for comparing the effects of various management practices on potential erosion, the advent of more mechanistic models such as the Revised Wind Erosion Equation (RWEQ) and the Wind Erosion Prediction System (WEPS) promises more realistic estimates of erosion by using easily measured local soil and climatic variables as inputs.

References

- Fryrear, D.W., 1986. A field dust sampler. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* 41, 117–120.
- Fryrear, D.W., Saleh, A., Bilbro, J.D., Schomberg, H.M., Stout, J.E., Zobeck, T.M. 1998. Revised Wind Erosion Equation (RWEQ). Wind Erosion and Water Conservation Research Unit, USDA-ARS-SPA Cropping Systems Research Laboratory. Technical Bulletin No. 1. <http://www.csrl.ars.usda.gov/wewc/rweq.htm>.
- Ingram, J., Lee, J., Valentin, C., 1996. The GCTE Soil Erosion Network: A multi-participatory research program. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* 51 (5), 377–380.
- Stout, J.E., 1990. Wind erosion in a simple field. *Trans ASAE* 33, 1597–1600.
- Stout, J.E., Zobeck, T.M., 1996. The Wolfforth field experiment: a wind erosion study. *Soil Sci.* 161, 616–632.
- USDA-SCS 1978. National Agronomy Manual: Erosion Handbook. USDA Soil Conservation Service, US Govt. Print. Off, Washington, DC.
- Woodruff, N.P., Armbrust, D.V., 1968. A monthly climatic factor for the wind erosion equation. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* 23, 103–104.
- Woodruff, N.P., Siddoway, F.H., 1965. A wind erosion equation. *SSSA Proc.* 29, 602–608.